

have a merchant marine second to none in the world.

RENT SUBSIDY

(Mr. GLENN ANDREWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the attempt by the apologists of "rent subsidy" all over America to justify this insidious legislation as an instrument of private enterprise is a sorry chapter in the annals of American politics. Lining the pockets of landlords with a 40-year Government dole to build houses for sociological purposes is anything but private enterprise. The promise to these same landlords that they will retain private enterprise management over these federally financed properties in the light of section VI of the Civil Rights Act is a hoax and camouflage that cries out for exposure. Washington bureaucrats will manage "rent subsidy" properties even though landlords retain title to these properties.

From the time that man emerged from the caves to build his lean-to's and adobe huts, man's house has been his modest private enterprise masterpiece. Even a few years back our Government under FHA seemed favorably inclined to home ownership. Increasingly, however, Government has extended its mantle of public responsibility over housing and diluted the value and incentives of home ownership. Those who would undermine or destroy the most widely held and most cherished of private property by subjecting it to increasing public management are, in fact, enemies of private enterprise. Federal control is threatening the private sector of housing and the wolf "rent subsidy" is running around in the sheep's clothing of private enterprise.

ESCALATION OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

(Mr. ROBISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, for some time now it has been obvious that whatever "consensus" the President has enjoyed in support of his military-political policy in Vietnam was in danger of dissolving. But Mr. Johnson has done nothing whatsoever—nor said anything—to keep the "all-out-war" attitude of the right or the "get-out-of-the-war" attitude of the left from feeding on the dwindling, moderate center of public opinion concerning our future in Vietnam.

The result has been a steady decline in the President's "popularity"—if such public opinion polls mean anything at all—with consequent embarrassment to the numerous Democratic Congressmen who must stand for reelection this November, many of whom reportedly have been considering divorcing their campaigns from the administration.

Quite clearly, the pressure was on the President to take some dramatic action

in Vietnam to bolster his position, and there has been speculation here for several weeks that his eventual decision would be one involving a further escalation of the military side of our effort. That action has now been taken.

Few of use here in Congress are military "experts"; I certainly am not and it is, therefore, difficult for me to assess the need for or the wisdom of bombing such installations near Hanoi and Haiphong as were hit by our planes this morning. This step has, reportedly, long been urged by General Westmoreland and other military professionals but, until now, it has been repeatedly rejected by the President as, apparently, "too risky" from both a military and political standpoint. That situation may now have changed sufficiently, in Mr. Johnson's judgment, to justify what has been done, and the validity of his new assessment will only be established by the future course of events.

As for the Congress, I assume it will again "support" the President's action. There is little else it can do for this whole affair only serves, once again, to point up the fact that military strategy in a "war" of whatever kind is for the President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, to determine.

I would express the hope, however, that this decision to so escalate the war rests on sound military necessity and that Mr. Johnson—who, almost alone, is in possession of the full intelligence reports—is convinced that it will lead to an earlier resolution of this difficult and dangerous war; conversely, I would also express the hope that the President's decision was not based, in any way, on his assessment of the domestic political "necessities," whatever they may be.

In the meantime, skeptics to the contrary, I continue to believe that, in the long run, the outcome of the elections projected for September 11 in South Vietnam—if those elections can somehow be made wholly free and the integrity of their result insured through some sort of international supervision—will be as important a factor in bringing about an early and honorable resolution of the conflict as whatever new military action we may take on the ground or in the air.

POSTAL SERVICE DETERIORATING

(Mr. RUMSFELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that our postal service has been deteriorating in recent years. In fact, I have taken the floor on several occasions to discuss the deterioration in service, the reasons for it, and some possible steps which we might take to correct this problem which touches every person in the country. Clearly, there is no segment of our society that does not in some way rely on the postal service. I do not believe it is enough simply to criticize the service, to point out instances of poor service, poor policy, poor administration. To criticize is not difficult, to offer avenues of solution is somewhat more difficult.

But, there appear to be several basic problems which are repeatedly mentioned by the Post Office Department when complaints are forwarded and solutions are sought. One seems to be inadequate funds to attract qualified people—and enough of them—into the postal service. Because of this, I submitted a statement to the Appropriations Committee earlier this year urging that adequate funds be appropriated to relieve this complaint. Another problem stems from a lack of incentives necessary to retain those qualified people who do enter the service.

To my mind, the long standing practice of using postmasterships as political patronage severely weakens the postal system at a time when the postal service needs every form of support and assistance it can get. In my testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress last year, I recommended that steps be taken to remove postmaster appointments from political interference. Because of my strong feeling on this point, on March 10 of this year, I introduced a bill H.R. 13586, to remove the appointment of postmasters from politics. I strongly believe that postmasters and rural letter carriers as well, ought to be selected on the basis of their abilities rather than on the basis of their political connections. A merit system covering these postal employees ought to be adopted immediately.

Apparently, I am not alone in my thinking on this matter. The Evening Star of June 24 reported on an article written by Donald Ledbetter, National Association of Postal Supervisors, in the association's magazine, in which he blames politics in postal supervisory and managerial appointments "as one of the major reasons for inadequate mail service."

According to the article by Joseph Young:

Mr. Ledbetter "charged that politics instead of merit motivates the promotions of many employees elevated to supervisory jobs . . . and criticized the appointment of postmasters on a patronage basis."

Mr. Ledbetter, it is reported states further:

If we could stop all the talk about merit promotions and really have merit promotions the mail service would improve.

Apparently, Mr. Ledbetter and I have arrived at the same conclusion. There is not a Member of the House, I am sure, who has not experienced and recognized deteriorating mail service.

I urge the Members of the House to join with me in supporting H.R. 13586 as a step in helping to restore the postal service to the respected, reliable institution it once was.

BOMBING IN HAIPHONG-HANOI AREA

(Mr. CALLAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President and the Secretary of Defense on the recent move in

June 28, 1966

Vietnam to bomb oil dumps in the Haiphong-Hanoi area.

I feel sure we all understand the pressing necessity for these moves. For too long we have waited for the administration to take the necessary steps to back up our fighting men and to close the open sources of supply in Haiphong.

We have now taken an important and vital step. We have reduced one source of enemy supply, and thereby reduced by that much the enemy's effectiveness against our boys. For this we are all thankful.

I feel, however, it is ironic that our administration felt it necessary to consult the British before making this decision. Britain has over the years led the free world parade of nations shipping supplies into Haiphong. How do we know that the very oil destroyed was not brought in by British ships?

I see no reason to get permission from Britain for any action we may take in Vietnam until such time as Great Britain sees fit to cease its aid to our enemies.

EQUITABLE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution calling for drafting of a plan to insure equitable geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds.

This bill would require the National Science Foundation to formulate recommendations to Congress for changes in the laws under which research and development funds are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by Federal agencies to higher education institutions; and achieve a better geographical distribution of such funds.

There is no doubt in my mind that more equitable distribution of the almost \$16 billion for research and development by the several Federal agencies can and must be made.

In the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Armed Services Committee, on which it is my privilege to serve from its inception, I have come to know the importance of many of these research activities. No one challenges the need for intensive programs of science, research, and technology. There are vast frontiers yet to conquer. What is of merited concern, is direct or indirect control by the Federal Government, of over 80 percent of all research scientists and technicians.

No State, nor region of the country has a corner on the ability to produce brainpower. We must take steps to insure a more equitable distribution of the Federal funds for research and development, which have become an integral part of maintaining academic excellence.

There is substantial evidence that a large percentage of the research grants awarded by several Federal agencies have gone to higher educational institutions in the East, Northeast, and west coast.

[Mr. PUCINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 157]

Abbott	Hagen, Calif.	Pike
Addabbo	Hanna	Poage
Arends	Harsha	Pool
Baring	Harvey, Ind.	Powell
Barrett	Hébert	Reid, N.Y.
Bates	Herlong	Reifel
Belcher	Jerman	Resnick
Bell	Jennings	Reuss
Bolton	Jones, Ala.	Rivers, Alaska
Bray	Karsh	Rogers, Fla.
Brock	Kelly	Roncallo
Carey	King, N.Y.	Rooney, N.Y.
Clausen,	Kluczynski	Scott
Don H.	Kupferman	Shipley
Clawson, Del.	Lennon	Sickles
Colmer	Long, La.	Sweeney
Conyers	Long, Md.	Taylor
de la Garza	McDowell	Thompson, N.J.
Dyal	McEwen	Toil
Ellsworth	McVicker	Udall
Everett	Mackie	Utt
Evins, Tenn.	Mailliard	Vanik
Farbstein	Martin, Ala.	Watkins
Farnum	Martin, Mass.	Williams
Flood	Meeds	Willis
Fogarty	Mink	Wilson, Bob
Frelinghuysen	Mize	Wilson,
Fulton, Tenn.	Morris	Charles H.
Giamo	Murray	Wright
Gibbons	Nix	Yates
Gilbert	O'Neal, Ga.	
Gurney	Pepper	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 338 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DECISION TO BOMB HANOI AND HAIPHONG

(Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the bombing of the installation at Haiphong, and the port facilities and military installations in and around Hanoi, comes as a welcome development. Those of us who have been asking for this should now applaud the President for having made the decision. The Joint

Chiefs have recommended it, and the President has acceded to their request.

Moreover, General Westmoreland, our great South Carolinian, has requested it. It is a welcome development.

From all accounts nearly 50 planes were involved in the raid, and the two installations were hit simultaneously. My report is that smoke went up many, many thousands of feet in the air. The objective was to knock out the POL about which we have been complaining, containing some 550,000 barrels of petroleum, and covering approximately a 150-acre tract of land waiting for someone to hit it. The oil in these areas was indispensable to the conduct of the war from the North Vietnamese standpoint.

Indeed, all of their mobility, logistics, and infiltration into South Vietnam were dependent on this petroleum.

The President made a wise decision. I requested it a year ago. I requested it in November. I requested it in January. Now I do not think I should say it is long overdue. Of course, it is overdue. But it has come, and now that it has come, we must back the President in whatever eventualities the action may bring forth.

Frankly, I do not think the Chinese can afford to come in. Their logistic problems would be bad. They would be sitting ducks for us, if we mean business, and I take it that we do. In addition, they have their own troubles in China.

But the GI's have been dying. We have left a lot of bones, blood, and bodies in the paddies of South Vietnam. This action will help the morale of those boys who are fighting there. There have been over 24,000 casualties, 4,000 of which are dead, and they want this action. They deserve it. They now have it. Let us, the American people, give the President the backing to which he is entitled.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, on the statement which he has made. I join him in supporting the President in his decision, which was necessary and indispensable. The escalation of the war on the part of the North Vietnamese and of the Vietcong is something which must be made expensive for them and not for American boys.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. This is a fact of life that the Vietcong can see. They have seen some of the installations in Hanoi hit. They have a very large reservoir which, if we bomb, will result in flooding them out.

They want business, and I think we ought to accommodate them. They want our compliments; this is the best way I know to give it to them.

Some people have called me a hawk. No one has ever called me a dove. When I send someone to fight for me, I would rather have a hawk fighting for me than a dove. So let us get on with this business. Let us win this war. We have the

enemy on the ropes. This could be the knockout blow.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I compliment him for his statement and for bringing to the attention of the House the action of the President in extending our activities in Vietnam. I simply want to add my "amen."

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I think the statement that he has made is indeed typical of the attitude which he has exemplified and has expressed for some considerable period of time. While, of course, none of us look forward to anything that could extend or escalate a war, there are times when decisions, such as the one that the gentleman reported to the House, must be made, and I think that this is a welcome report and one which will receive the enthusiastic support of the American people. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the bombing of petroleum storage facilities near Hanoi and Haiphong by South Vietnamese and U.S. forces must be seen in light of the fact that these were military targets in every sense of the word. As such, the bombing is therefore a further expression of the firmness of our commitment in Vietnam. Hopefully, the increased clarity of that intention may hasten the willingness of Hanoi and Peking to discuss an honorable negotiated settlement.

In my opinion, there is no relationship between the timing of these raids and the current visit to Peking of North Vietnam's President Ho Chi Minh. Actually, it should be noted that the bombing came only after the repeated rejections by Hanoi of numerous peace-seeking overtures, many of which were made by several nations including Eastern European countries and even the Soviet Union itself.

I believe that President Johnson had no alternative but to order that such military targets be bombed, particularly since the POL stored in these facilities is vital to the Vietcong's military effort in South Vietnam. Certainly to the extent that the bombing was in keeping with President Johnson's determination to pursue our goals in Vietnam with prudent restraint it was justified. The added assurance that civilian casualties were kept to a minimum also supports the soundness of this decision.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 153, a quorum call, on June

27, 1966, I am recorded as being absent. I was present in the Chamber and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the Journal and permanent Record be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL PAIRINGS

(Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I note the emergence on the American scene of two new public opinion pollsters. They are amateurs, but I fear they may be with us for some time or at least until November 8.

The first poll is the Bliss poll. Its creator is the national chairman of the Republican Party. His first intelligence is a report that President Johnson's popularity has decreased even below the 46 percent figure of a recent Gallup poll. This communique was published in the Washington Post of June 21, 1966.

But the very next day the Gallup poll reported that President Johnson's popularity rating was 50 percent, and that the 6-month slide in his rating had been halted.

Thus, of the GOP chairman's sally into polling it might be said, "in ignorance there is Bliss," or vice versa.

The other amateur pollster is none other than Gov. George Romney, of Michigan. The Romney poll appeared in the same issue of the Washington Post as the ill-fated Bliss poll. Governor Romney's poll is much more global. He disdains figures and percentages. He just deal with the U.S. image and the world.

According to Governor Romney, the world now views the United States as a nation "no longer dedicated to peace."

The dispatch does not state how many interviewers the Romney poll sent out. It does not state how many people throughout the world they questioned. It does not state what question they asked, nor how, nor when. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the Romney poll says flatly that the United States "has too largely become, in the eyes of the world, the practical successor of 19th century white colonialism."

This amateur Romney poll may be contrasted with some professional polls taken in various States around the country. In these polls, people were asked how they would vote for President if elections were held this year.

Mr. Speaker, here is a rundown on how voters answered this important question:

In Paterson, N.J.:	Percent
Johnson	68
Romney	32

In Maine:	Percent
Johnson	55
Romney	45
Johnson	55
Nixon	45
Johnson	65
Goldwater	35

In Virginia:

	Percent
Johnson	51
Nixon	49
Johnson	52
Goldwater	48
Johnson	54
Romney	46

In Tennessee:

	Percent
Johnson	66
Nixon	34
Johnson	72
Goldwater	28
Johnson	75
Romney	25

In West Virginia:

	Percent
Johnson	59
Romney	41
Johnson	61
Nixon	39

In North Carolina—Guilford County:

	Percent
Johnson	66
Romney	34
Johnson	73
Nixon	27

In New Jersey:

	Percent
Johnson	66
Nixon	34
Johnson	67
Scranton	33

In Pennsylvania:

	Percent
Johnson	55
Scranton	45
Johnson	59
Nixon	41

In New York:

	Percent
Johnson	67
Nixon	33
Johnson	67
Romney	33
Johnson	82
Rockefeller	18

Mr. Speaker, the voters' preference for President Johnson is even seen in the Wolverine State, of which George Romney is Governor, for in Michigan the voters' choice is as follows:

	Percent
Johnson	51
Romney	49

Mr. Speaker, my intention in speaking has been to demonstrate that politics is one thing and polling another. More especially, it is to protect the professional polling fraternity of Lou Harris, George Gallup, and others, from the incursions of amateurs like George Romney and Ray Bliss.

INSURING WATERSIDE BEAUTIFICATION

(Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation with my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. VANK] for the purpose of insuring waterside beautification. Although this legislation is not far reaching and although it does not involve a multimillion dollar appropriation; I think it still merits the attention of my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The last few years have seen a spate of legislation in reference to both our rivers and harbors as well as to beauti-

June 29, 1966

13966

fication of highways and urban areas. This is all well and good; for too long we have allowed both our streets and our waterways to remain in states of disrepair and dilapidation. It is a credit to both the executive departments involved and to the Congress that these black marks on modern America are now well on the way to solution.

Urban areas and highways are being cleaned up and beautified as never before. Also, our harbors and our rivers are being cleaned and purified; such natural enemies as beach erosion, flooding and noxious materials are being slowly but surely eliminated—after many, many years of hard work.

It is all the more sad, then, that our waterways are still infested with a certain kind of hazard which is as dangerous as it is esthetically displeasing. I am referring to old and abandoned ships, hulls and pilings, found on many of our Nation's most beautiful and serviceable rivers, bays, inlets and channels. The legislation which my colleague from Ohio and I have cosponsored today would authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to remove these rusting and dangerous eyesores from our waters.

Under title 33 of the United States Code and under Public Law 89-298, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965, the Corps of Engineers has certain and diverse powers it may perform. It dredges rivers; it studies noxious weeds; it prepares flood control projects; it administers programs to eradicate water growths. Now, if H.R. 16064 becomes enacted, it will have the power and authority to remove abandoned and rotting discarded boats from our waters.

Last week, my colleague from Ohio wrote to the District Commissioners:

I am shocked at the absence of Federal and state laws concerning the disposition of navigational wrecks abandoned in public waters.

I, too, am shocked and I hope that this legislation will change past history.

Of course, there is another reason besides esthetics why this problem cries out for solution. Besides being a blight on our landscape, these vessels are demonstrably dangerous. It is common knowledge that loose pilings and parts of ships adrift in rivers in the past few months have been responsible for extensive damage to many moving crafts.

Last year, measures were enacted to clean New York Bay and the Kill Von Kull of debris and other similar matters. The results were happily amazing—the figure of a half-million cubic feet of driftwood which Army-operated drift-collecting boats had collected through 1961 was drastically cut. Pleasure boat operators found that they could operate their vessels with less worry than before.

I represent the district from New Jersey which includes the Raritan Bay—all the boatowners in our area are well aware of the need to remove the dangerous pilings, boats and parts of boats from the bay area. This matter has been neglected far too long.

In October of 1965, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Maryland

[Mr. SICKLES] introduced a bill—H.R. 11537—calling for the Secretary of the Army to remove certain abandoned ships from the Potomac River—no action has been taken on this bill. We in New Jersey as well as our friends in Maryland, Ohio, and all other States with waterways recognize that this is a problem which must be faced and solved as soon as possible. It cries for immediate solution.

We have embarked upon a comprehensive program of beautification as well as a program of waterway improvement. It is a shame that both of these will be, in a sense, atrophied and debilitated if we allow abandoned ships to monopolize the Nation's waterways.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate consideration of this legislation.

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous material.)

[Mr. STRATTON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous material.)

[Mr. STRATTON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AMPUTEES AND BLINDED VETERANS OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM ENTITLED TO RECEIVE FULL BENEFITS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the most deserving of our veterans returning from Vietnam—those courageous men who, in the defense of our country have suffered the loss of either hands, feet or eyesight—are, under existing law, being denied some of the same benefits accorded to those brave men who served in World War II and the Korean conflict.

The time is long since past when action should have been taken to correct this deficiency.

I am, therefore, today introducing legislation which would amend the current law, title 38, United States Code, chapter 39, paragraphs 1901(a) and 1905.

Under the present law, veterans who suffered the loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet; loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands; and/or permanent impairment of vision of both eyes during World War II or the Korean conflict are entitled to receive up to \$1,600 toward the purchase of an automobile or other conveyance.

This legislation would amend the law to read "during World War II or the Korean conflict or after January 31, 1955." This would enable those veterans of the conflict in Vietnam and others who receive the aforementioned disabilities in military activity to receive the same benefits as the amputees and blinded veterans who served their country in earlier wars.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I am introducing would eliminate the time limitations for applications for these funds which, under the current law, stipulates that the veteran must apply for the money within 5 years of his discharge or release from military service. In addition, this legislation goes one step further and becomes retroactive to World War II, enabling those disabled veterans who qualify to apply for this benefit even though they have been separated from the service for as long as 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, I was a cosponsor of the Veterans Readjustment Act of 1966, also known as the cold war GI bill, which provided for guaranteed and direct home loans, medical care, preference in Federal employment, burial flags, job counseling and job placement assistance and soldiers' and sailors' civil relief. The legislation I am proposing today is in keeping with the provisions of that bill which recognizes the sacrifices being made today by our men in uniform. I now urge my colleagues to take swift action to guarantee and immediately provide these benefits to those men who in combat situations have suffered the loss of sight, limb, or both.

FREEDOM FOSTERS CHANGE

(Mr. KING of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from the State of Utah, the Honorable FRANK E. MOSS, presented an address on June 25, 1966, at the Youth Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Philadelphia. I found his words to be especially stimulating and worthy of study in these times of seeming peril and uncertainty. Because of the inspirational, timely, and patriotic message it contains, I include this address in my remarks today:

FREEDOM FOSTERS CHANGE

(Speech of Senator FRANK E. MOSS, LDS Youth Conference, Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1966)

In a scant ten years we shall celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence—July 4, 1776.

In just twenty years we shall be commemorating the bicentenary of our Constitutional convention which opened in November, 1788.

Out of these two events came our nationhood. Both of them occurred here in Philadelphia.

You sit today in the city of brotherly love, in Philadelphia the cradle of our liberty. The symbols of our great patriotic and spiritual heritage are all around you.

What better time or place to ponder the tremendous events which bequeathed to us our freedom and the framework of our Government, and to draw from them a sense of continuity and a sense of purpose.

July 4, 1776 we are told, was a surprisingly cool day in Philadelphia. Thomas Jefferson reports that on July 3rd he bought a new thermometer for \$19, and on July 4th he recorded the following readings: 6 a.m. 68 degrees; 9 a.m. 72½ degrees; 1 p.m. 76 degrees; 9 p.m. 73½ degrees.

But the beruffled and bewigged men from the Thirteen American Colonies inside the state house were aridly aware of the delightful weather outside. They were warmed by

June 29, 1966

BOMBING IN HAIPHONG-HANOI AREA

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the report which I have just read on the wire that the United States has actually carried out its much rumored plan to bomb the oil depots located near the population centers of Hanoi and Haiphong, is a matter of deep concern.

Our objective in Vietnam should not be to further escalate the war but to bring it to the conference table. I fail to see how this new bombing, which makes a new level in the war's intensity, can help us to achieve this objective.

Certainly previous increases in troop commitments and bombing attacks have not brought us any closer to negotiations, or a peace conference or a cease-fire. They have only increased the war to a more dangerous level of conflict, or at best to new and higher levels of stalemate.

The bombing of oil storage depots today is a dangerous policy. It will probably slow the rate of infiltration from the north, but the record shows that it certainly will not stop or finally deter it. More important, it raises the serious question of whether Communist China will not now provide air cover to protect what she considers to be a vital resource, and, if she does, whether the United States will not in turn bomb the bases used by her planes. This could lead us directly to the far larger war which would destroy far more than it would accomplish. It would lead to the larger war which we should be striving to avoid.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I support our commitment to enable the South Vietnamese people to determine their own future, free from the outside interference of those who would determine it for them.

But to meet this commitment, I believe we should concentrate our efforts in South Vietnam. In particular, I believe that we should utilize every resource at our command—including the withholding of further military support, if this should prove necessary—to insure that free elections are held soon and that an early transition is made to a popularly based civilian government.

This should be the objective of our efforts, not further military escalation in the North.

OBSERVANCE OF WEEK OF JULY FOURTH AS NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, once again it is nearing that time of the year for all Americans to place special effort in the observance of the week of July Fourth as National Safe Boating Week. That week is expressly dedicated to the safety of those Americans who spend much of their leisure time using the waterways of this great Nation.

The cause of National Safe Boating Week is worthy enough that the President of the United States issued the following proclamation in accordance with Public Law 85-445, which I sponsored in the 85th Congress:

The family boating trip has now become almost as common in American life as the family picnic. It is a profound testimony to the strength of our American system and the scope of our prosperity that the recreation of boating, once the pastime of a privileged few, is now enjoyed by millions of families from all walks of life.

With the steadily increasing traffic of our waterways, however, it is vital that no efforts be spared to keep boating safe as well as stimulating. The knowledge and practice of safe boating principles can make hours spent upon the water measurably safer and more pleasurable.

Since 1958, when the Congress first requested the President to annually proclaim National Safe Boating Week, the rise in boating accidents has been largely checked. This record can be maintained—and improved—only if the nation's boating organizations, Federal and State agencies, and the boating industry continue their efforts to inform the public of the importance of safe boating practices.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 3, 1966 as National Safe Boating Week.

I urge every American who uses our waterways to re-examine his boating habits during this Week and decide what he can do, individually and together with his countrymen, to reduce accidents and prevent the needless waste of lives on the water.

I also invite the Governors of the States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States of America to join in this observance and ask them to exert their influence in the cause of safe boating during this Week and throughout the entire year.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this 19th day of January in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninetyeth.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

This proclamation is clearly indicative of the importance that the President attaches to recreational boating safety and National Safe Boating Week.

INCREASE IN RECREATIONAL BOATING

To make the ideals of safe boating interesting as well as vital to the entire boating industry and the boating public, the U.S. Coast Guard enlists the continual assistance and cooperation of organizations such as the Coast Guard Auxiliary, the U.S. Power Squadrons, the National Safety Council, as well as boatmen everywhere.

Safe boating is an enormously big project when it is considered there will be over 40 million Americans in more than 7½ million boats of all kinds plying the waters from the far reaches of Guam in the Pacific to the Virgin Islands in the Atlantic, and from Alaska across the Continent to Puerto Rico. Every river, lake, inlet, and bay where navigation by any kind of craft is possible will note the presence of the American boatman.

The boating industry reports that overall recreational expenditures have risen nearly 50 percent since 1956, and net

sales of boats have increased well over 50 percent during the same period. Dollar shipments of marine products other than boats and motors posted another all-time high monthly average for 1965. For the fourth year in a row, Americans increased their retail spending on boats and boating equipment. The 1965 estimate—a new record—was over \$2¼ billion. This huge amount of money was spent for new and used boats, motors, accessories, safety equipment, fuel, insurance, docking fees, maintenance, club dues, storage, repairs, and club memberships.

The Coast Guard released its annual Recreational Boating Statistics Report, as required by the Federal Boating Act of 1958, on May 2d of this year. The Federal Boating Act of 1958, provides for a standardized system for the numbering and identification of undocumented vessels, including the pleasure boats of more than 10 horsepower, and also for participation in this program by the several States. Since the effective day of this legislation, April 1, 1960, 47 States have enacted into law numbering systems which have been approved by the U.S. Coast Guard, as meeting the standards set forth in this act.

The safety aspect of the tremendous explosive growth in recreational boating is of increasing concern to the Coast Guard. Compare 1965's 4,138,000 registered boats with the 16,000 in 1905, or even the 2¼ million in 1945, and the need for boating safety as a full-time operation is quite apparent. More boats plus more people logically add up to more chances for boating accidents. Although the number of boats is constantly increasing, the number of accidents this past year decreased. We hope this decline is due to boating safety efforts. On the other hand, fatalities increased in 1965 and even the rate of fatalities went up. A total of 1360 persons died. Improvement is very necessary. This is why the need for boating safety has reached the attention of the Congress, the legislature of every State, the press, as well as the boating industry and right down to the individual who constitutes one part of the entire boating public. The most effective safety efforts lie with the individual boatman.

ACCIDENT RATE DECLINED

In its annual report, the Coast Guard revealed that 41 percent, or 563 of the 1,360 deaths due to boating accidents last year, were from vessels outside the numbering provisions of this act. The 563 deaths from vessels not required to be numbered, including rowboats, canoes, sailboats, rafts, and other small craft, are 14 more than occurred in 1964. Overall, 168 more people died in boating accidents in 1965 than in 1964. During the same period, 1965, the numbering of boats in all States and territorial possessions of the United States rose to an all time high of over 4 million. This is an increase of more than one quarter of a million boats over the previous year.

Capsizings, as in past years, still remain as the largest type of casualty in the recorded deaths. In 1965, capsizings took 40 percent of the total number of lives lost in boating accidents. This

June 29, 1966

13987

MAURICE SALTZMAN WINS NATIONAL HUMAN RELATIONS AWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Conference of Christians and Jews conferred its National Human Relations Award on Maurice Saltzman at a memorable ceremony in Cleveland, Ohio, on June 20, 1966. Mr. Saltzman, a native of Cleveland, has become one of its most famous sons. Over 2,000 leading citizens of Cleveland, of Ohio, and of the Nation gathered to pay him a well deserved tribute.

Thomas Vail, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, served as toastmaster and presented an impressive array of speakers, including Dr. Sterling W. Brown, president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and Gov. George W. Romney.

Among those participating in the award dinner were prominent leaders of religious life in Ohio, Most Rev. Clarence G. Issenmann, coadjutor bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Cleveland, Rev. O. M. Hoover, minister of Olivet Institutional Baptist Church, and Rabbi Alan S. Green, of Temple Emanu El in University Heights. It was my privilege to be present at the national award dinner.

Francis A. Coy, served as general chairman, and Abe M. Luntz as arrangements chairman, in making this an outstanding success.

Some warm insights on the life and character of Maurice Saltzman were included in the printed program and signed by three initials that are legendary in Cleveland, L.B.S.—Louis B. Seltzer, retired editor of the Cleveland Press.

I include Mr. Seltzer's tribute at this point in my remarks:

Being rich doesn't mean the same to Maurice Saltzman as it may to most of us. . . .

His parents died before he was five. He had to be sequestered in an orphanage—Bellefai—where he remained until he graduated from Cleveland Heights High School, with excellent grades.

How he started in the garment business, learned the ropes, launched his own company at the age of 21 with only \$2000 and built the fabulous, more than \$100,000,000 Bobbie Brooks empire are chapters of the Maury Saltzman story that are known to all.

So is the fact that he took into his organization other Bellefai orphans and saw Bobbie Brooks thrive all the more because of their skill and devotion.

So Maury Saltzman, still in his 40's has become by any standard a very wealthy man.

But money is only the materially measurable part of his wealth. He is far richer than many realized because he learned as a young man that the richest part of life is sharing with, working for, putting an arm of friendship around the shoulders of others.

Over his busy years Maury has injected the same zest with which he made a success of business into all manner of civic and welfare work.

He has already in his youthful life been chairman of tremendously successful Jewish welfare fund-raising campaigns. . . . He has lent his skillful guidance to the United Appeal. . . . He has been a wise and

valued counselor in his own Temple Emanu El. . . . He and his wife Shirley have placed Mount Sinai Hospital on the threshold of greatness through a \$1,000,000 gift. . . . He has donated generously to such institutions as Harvard University. . . . Brandeis. . . . Notre Dame. . . . Case Tech. . . . Western Reserve. . . . He has established Bobbie Brooks scholarships to young women for college educations. . . . These and many other things.

With it all, Maury Saltzman, alight in stature though he may be, has been a towering force for good in the work of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He has toured the nation in behalf of brotherhood but, more important than that, he has lived his own daily life in the spirit of Brotherhood of Man under the Fatherhood of God to the measureless spiritual as well as material benefit of others.

Thus the distinguished name of Maurice Saltzman is inextricably linked with the distinguished National Human Relations Award tonight, and becomes a member of the select company of its proud and humble possessors.

—L. B. S.

Mr. Speaker, the response of Maurice Saltzman following presentation of the award stands as a challenge to purposeful action by all who care about the welfare and the future of our Nation.

The text of his remarks follows:

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS BY MR. SALTZMAN

Mr. Chairman, sometimes a man's feelings run so deep that there is no way for him to express them fully. Tonight is one of those times.

I appreciate more than I can say the honor that is being paid to me. I am keenly aware of how distinguished have been those who received the award in previous years, and I am thrilled to join their company.

I have been involved in the affairs of this Conference for many years and I am, of course, delighted that it should have chosen me to symbolize the dedication of its volunteer workers. And I am grateful to all of you who have come here tonight to rededicate yourselves to the work of the Conference and to share with me this wonderful experience.

But none of these expressions of gratitude can begin to convey how much this evening means to me. I have, therefore, come to the conclusion that the only satisfactory way to show appreciation for all the blessings we receive in this blessed land is not through words, but through acts.

And that is my theme for the few remarks I wish to make tonight. . . . That all of us, individuals and organizations alike, will be judged, not by what we say, but by what we do.

For we are truly living in a revolutionary age. Some people and some organizations find that condition extremely uncomfortable. I have no doubt there were thousands of Americans at the time of the Revolutionary War who wished that they were not living in a time of political revolution. Some of them went away to Canada to spare themselves the turmoil of wrestling with the great military and political problems of their day. But those we remember and honor are those who stayed and became involved in solving the day by day problems the country faced.

I have no doubt there were millions of people all over the world at the time of the Industrial Revolution who wished they had not been born in that revolutionary age. They were dismayed by all the technical changes and yearned for "the good old days" when, they thought, there were no problems. But those we remember and honor are those who became deeply involved in all the problems

resulting from industrial progress. . . . who worked to create better methods of production and better conditions for working people.

Well, we, too, are in an age of change and upheaval—greater than any the world has ever experienced. Our revolution is essentially a social revolution. . . . a revolution in relationships that is making the way we conducted our affairs in the past completely dead.

And there are those who are dismayed. They see the protests and the marches and the unrest on the campus and they wish it would all go away.

But it will not go away. The upheaval and the turmoil are symptoms of real and profound problems, and they will go away only when those problems have been solved. . . . by the efforts of individuals and organizations that have the vision to see beyond the symptoms to the underlying causes.

I do not, of course, mean to say that there is not danger and violence and at times plain stupidity in some of the protest and demonstration that seem so popular these days.

Every period of change brings out those elements. But the task of those of us who choose sounder methods for solving social problems is to devote ourselves with equal dedication to the noble task of making this a better place to live.

For if we are to be honored by the generations that come after us, both as individuals and as organizations, we must see beyond the turmoil and rioting. Our objective is social justice and a better world for all. And we will not achieve it by standing pat or by sighing after the good old days that really weren't that good. Our thoughts and our actions should be concerned with the tough and earthy problems of a changing present and an exciting future. . . . and not with recapturing of the past.

I welcome the challenge of our day. I am tremendously hopeful. Catholics, Protestants and Jews are talking together and working together as never before in history.

Negroes are moving into posts of responsibility as never before. We are beginning to address ourselves to the great problems of poverty as never before.

Of course the dangers ahead are great. Only a fool would deny that we are living at a time when the whole world may smash up. But only a fool would fail to recognize that we are also living in an age when, for the first time, we have a chance to create a really magnificent world for all men. . . . if we are imaginative enough and flexible enough and courageous enough to bring it into being. And if we work through not only our words but through our acts.

In these dramatic days, words of good will are no longer enough. What good is an expression of friendship between two friends if they cannot break bread together because of practices that have no place in the modern world? How can there be real friendship. . . . not a friendship of words. . . . if our practice is so unfriendly.

Some of us do not approve of demonstrations, in the sense that the word is used these days. But if we don't, we had better do our own type of demonstrating. . . . demonstrating that this city is a model city in human relations. . . . that it is prepared to face up to the tough, concrete everyday problems of getting rid of every vestige of racial and religious discrimination.

We shall be judged by our acts, not by our words. . . .

And so, Mr. Chairman, I accept this award by dedicating myself and my energies to the same task as this Conference is dedicated to: to make the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man not just glittering empty phrases but the profound, living commitments that will reshape the daily life of all our people.

June 29, 1966

Where is all this going to end unless we take a stand against these continuing policies and programs which can only further undermine the dollar—that basic pillar of all free world monetary responsibility and physical defense.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the June 22 New York Times be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 22, 1966]
AID RISE SOUGHT FOR POOR LANDS—WORLD BANK'S CHIEF WARNS FUNDS ARE DEPLETED
(By Albert L. Kraus)

WASHINGTON, June 21.—George D. Woods, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), said today he would begin a campaign early next month to win increased funds for the International Development Association, the soft-loan arm of the World Bank.

Mr. Woods predicted difficulty in winning Senate approval for the appropriation, but said it was essential if the I.D.A. was to continue operations beyond the end of this year. "We have about run out of funds," he said.

The I.D.A. makes interest-free development loans on 50-year terms to countries that do not qualify for regular World Bank credit.

Mr. Woods said there was no question that the United States and the six other countries that provided the bulk of support for I.D.A.—Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Japan and Canada—would continue their support. "The only question is how much," he declared.

Mr. Woods made his remarks in a review of the bank's activities to a group of newsmen at an annual briefing session at the bank's headquarters here.

Earlier, Irving S. Friedman, his economic adviser, estimated that the less-developed nations could use \$3-billion to \$4-billion more in development aid, largely on I.D.A.-type terms. He said this assessment resulted from a country-by-country review made a year ago and that the need was even greater now.

Mr. Woods said greater cooperation between the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund was developing in handling the problems of countries than ran into debt-rescheduling difficulties. He suggested that the problems were likely to increase.

The World Bank president said he was hopeful that he would be able to announce the final signature and ratification of the international agreement creating a Conciliation and Arbitration Service under World Bank auspices by the end of September, the date of the institution's annual meeting.

He said that 20 nations had to approve the agreement, which for the first time provides machinery for settling disputes between governments and private concerns. So far, he said, 37 nations have signed the agreement and six have ratified it. He added that if ratification was not accomplished by this year's annual meeting, "it certainly would be by next year."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield, if I have time remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to continue the colloquy.

I wish to point out that the rule of germaneness is technically in effect. Many Senators are most anxious to complete action on the pending bill. They have important engagements. While I do not wish to be discourteous to any Senator, I must hold down the amount of time taken for ordinary morning hour business.

Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for colloquy with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The point that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is making is that where these other nations today have capital, the sale of the World Bank bonds, and so on, should be made and bought in those countries rather than sold in the United States. That is fundamental.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The able Senator is correct. That is one of the points made.

Why go to the New York market for money when money is already so tight here in the United States, and when bonds could be sold abroad if a real effort was made? This money is ultimately for loans abroad.

Secondly, it is unfortunate that now when some hard loans, of the World Bank, come due, apparently the only way they can be paid out is by tapping the soft loan window of that Bank. This shows it actually was not a hard loan at all.

The plan now being developed can only work further against our very serious balance-of-payments problem; and of course against the best interest of the American taxpayer.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I was most impressed by the perceptive observation which my friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] makes.

I recall with him the eloquence with which the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] offered his proposal a year ago. That proposal will be before us again, together with the entire problem, in a couple of weeks.

I thank the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for the perceptive comments he has made.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I deeply appreciate the comments of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the distinguished assistant minority leader [Mr. KUCHEL], and I am gratified to note their interest in this important matter.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], as manager of the minority, yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] time on the bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from Massa-

chusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has concluded, that the absence of a quorum be suggested without impinging on the time under the control of either side.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will withhold his request for a moment, let me ask whether this is under the unanimous-consent request that the time will not be charged to the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield me 2 minutes on the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving my rights under the rule of germaneness, which I may have to invoke, I am happy to yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I regret to interrupt a unanimous-consent agreement on the pending legislation, but after all, I think a brief discussion of our war policy should come first.

THE BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, We have all received the tragic news over the wire services of the bombing by American planes within 3 miles of the heart of Hanoi, as well as the news of the bombing by American planes of docks in Haiphong Harbor.

Those of us who, from the beginning, have opposed the immorality and illegality of the U.S. war in southeast Asia are shocked and saddened by this inexcusable escalating of the war by the Johnson administration. In the very brief period I shall take, I wish to say that in my judgment this shocking international outlawry on the part of the Johnson administration in southwest Asia should, at least symbolically, lower to half mast every American flag everywhere in the world.

This course of warmaking by our country in an undeclared war has demonstrated to the world that the greatest threat to the peace of the world is now the United States. We can no longer, out of nationalistic smugness, take the position that our undeclared war does not endanger the lives of thousands of innocent civilians—men, women, and children in the population center of Hanoi.

This is the course of action that a General Ridgway, a General Gavin, and a George Kennan warned the American people months ago would be our country's course of action if we did not stop escalating the war.

As one opposed to this war from the beginning, let me say to the American people, "Your Government is conducting a shocking act of outlawry which will

Mr. President, Senator HARTKE has raised the question of the meaning of the language in the committee report on page 3 of this bill and whether it is designed to create an apparent exemption of calls made for legitimate business. For example, a call made by a bill collector. This language was inserted in an effort to clarify the fact that a legitimate call can be made even though it might harass the person called.

Repeated calls by a bill collector or the use of obscene language even by someone in business or trying to collect the bill is still prohibited by this legislation. Anyone pursuing legitimate business by telephone may do so so long as he adheres to the letter and intent of this act. The language of the report in no way should be construed to give special license to bill collectors, creditors, or anyone else even though his purpose be legitimate business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2825) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

THE WORLD BANK AND ITS SOFT LOAN WINDOW

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, with respect to the offering of \$175 million of bonds of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—World Bank—in the United States, and its effect upon the balance-of-payments problem of this country, apparently the World Bank did not think much of our apprehensions.

In this connection, despite the Bank believing that this money could not be borrowed abroad, the Inter-American Development Bank has just announced that it has borrowed \$10 million in Japan alone.

The Wall Street Journal of June 14 states:

George D. Woods, president, told a press conference that, in planning the offering, the international agency had agreed with the U.S. Treasury to initially invest the proceeds in the U.S. Government agency obligations and U.S. bank deposits to eliminate any immediate effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit . . .

In a statement before this body on June 16, however, I raised the question: Why is it necessary to issue these bonds if they are not going to be used for the purpose for which the World Bank is organized, namely, for making loans to other countries?

The bonds have behind them the guarantee of the callable capital subscribed to by the United States; and in the past World Bank bonds have been rated "triple A."

Why is it necessary to now offer more of them for sale through the "investment fraternity," when credit is already so tight in the United States, and at a time when American corporations are being asked to curtail their investment pro-

grams, in this country as well as abroad.

My overriding concern is the effect of such World Bank financing on the U.S. balance of payments. Although, in this particular issue, the World Bank said they would not use the proceeds for loans until the end of 1967, at the time they stated they expected to go back to the U.S. money market with new bond issues every fiscal year. The Bank has also left the door open to come back to the U.S. market any time before 1967.

Last year the Bank sold \$200 million in the U.S. market. It is true some of the bonds were sold abroad, but it is fair to assume that most of them find their way into U.S. investment portfolios.

What the World Bank is creating by these annual security issues is a continual flow of dollar funds which, of course, they intend to loan to other countries; and the annual report of the Bank for the fiscal year 1965, page 14, indicates that the commitments and disbursements of the Bank have been increasing by leaps and bounds.

Disbursements have increased from an average of approximately \$500 million a year between fiscal year 1959 and fiscal year 1961 to \$600 million in fiscal year 1965; but commitments have increased from approximately \$625 million a year in the fiscal year, 1959-61 period to over \$1 billion in 1965.

Admittedly, the Bank is going to need money to meet these commitments; and this brings us to the question of what will happen to the U.S. balance of payments as these disbursements are made. The record shows that identifiable procurement in the United States under World Bank loans in recent years is between 20 and 30 cents out of every dollar disbursed. The rest adds to our balance-of-payments imbalance by going to other countries.

It is clear that the World Bank is laying the groundwork now, for continual dollar outflow in the future, and unless this program is at least cut down to size, we will have that much more difficulty in finding our way out of the quagmire of international deficits.

Last year the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, offered an amendment to the Foreign Aid Act which directed the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative, "to refuse to permit the flotation in the United States of new security issues of the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, and to refuse to permit the proceeds of dollar borrowing of either of these two institutions from U.S. financial institutions to be exchanged for the currency of any other country until the United States had experienced a surplus in its balance of payments for four consecutive quarters."

After assurance was given the Senate by the Secretary of the Treasury that the balance-of-payments effects of these security issues would be considered in any new proposals, the minority leader did not press his amendment.

I hope he will offer it again this year. He should have our full support, because it would seem more necessary than ever to have congressional expression on this question.

What are the influences in the United States that are so strong as to achieve this continuance of a policy of "business as usual," a policy which in turn continues to erode the stability of the dollar and its purchasing power?

And there is more to all this than the above. As of March 31 of this year, the World Bank had \$2,158 million as an undisbursed balance of effective loans. At the same time the Bank held loans in the total amount of \$6,272 million.

Most of these loans—and one would presume commitments—are to a number of countries.

Outstanding loans to India for example total \$707 million, to Japan \$656 million, to Mexico \$507 million, to the Philippines \$100 million, to Brazil \$223 million, to Colombia \$331 million.

Now one of the principal arguments being made for the currently requested foreign aid program, and for such soft loan windows as the International Development Association—soft loan window of the World Bank—is the debt burden of aid-receiving countries.

In the Foreign Affairs magazine—January 1966, volume 44, No. 2—the President of the World Bank summed it all up when he said:

The solution of the debt problem is within the power and the means of the developed countries. They can ease their own terms, and they can dispense finance through other channels. One of the latter is the Bank's affiliate, IDA, the major international institution for transferring capital to the low-income countries on concessional terms. IDA's clients so far comprise 29 of the poorest nations; its credits are extended free of interest (although there is a small service charge) and for a term of 50 years.

There has been little delay in implementing these plans, as evidenced by an article of June 22 in the New York Times which starts off:

George D. Woods, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), said today he would begin a campaign early next month to win increased funds for the International Development Association, the soft-loan arm of the World Bank.

Mr. Woods predicted difficulty in winning Senate approval for the appropriation, but said it was essential if the I.D.A. was to continue operations beyond the end of this year.

"We have about run out of funds," he said.

It is all getting to be quite interesting. The World Bank continues to make hard loans from borrowings in the U.S. market, which borrowings add to the dollar drain. Then later the World Bank comes out for soft loans from their soft loan window in order to help many of these borrowers repay their World Bank obligations on what we the people had presumed was a sound hard loan. This further adds to the dollar drain.

Let us note the interesting comment: We have about run out of funds.

As the fiscal and monetary problems of the United States continue to increase, are we in turn to continue, forever, at the American taxpayers' expense, heavy 50-year, no-interest rate loans to other countries, at the same time domestic credit is steadily tightening in this country.

June 29, 1966

redound to the historic discredit of our country for generations to come."

Mr. President, I continue to plead that we return to the framework of our idealism and our Constitution. The American people should demand that the President of the United States stop this shocking bombing in North Vietnam by announcing to the world that we will dispense with further bombing in North Vietnam and call upon the other nations who are members of the United Nations to join us in enforcing a peace in southeast Asia.

The United Nations cannot justify its failure to order a cease-fire in southeast Asia and proceed to enforce it. The United States has a solemn obligation to history to support a cease-fire order.

I ask unanimous consent that a clipping from the Capital Times of Madison, Wis., dated June 27, 1966, be printed at this place in the Record, and that it be followed by an article "The Crime of Silence" from the June 17, 1966, issue of the Commonweal. The author, Gordon Zahn, is professor of sociology at Loyola University in Chicago.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Capital Times (Madison, Wis.)
June 27, 1966]

LAIRD SHEDS 'HAWK' FEATHERS

Representative MELVIN LAIRD, Republican of Marshfield, emphatically disputes those Wisconsin Democrats who paint him as an arch-warhawk urging expansion of the Viet Nam war.

"I am keeping the Republicans quiet on the issue. It is ridiculous to talk about military victory in Southeast Asia. I favor peace by negotiations."

LAIRD says President Johnson is the "hardest of the hard liners" and is determined to spare no resources in an effort to win the war.

At the same time, according to LAIRD, Johnson seeks to pose as a moderate, "by pointing to MORSE and FULBRIGHT on one hand and by trying to find some Republicans he can point to on the other."

"But as long as I am chairman of the House minority conference he's not going to be able to drive down that middle course."

"I have cautioned my people not to attack FULBRIGHT and FULBRIGHT has told me he appreciated what I was doing."

LAIRD feels the administration made a grave blunder in Viet Nam by sending in ground troops rather than "using the power we had in areas where we are supreme"—namely air power and a "Kennedy-type" blockade of Haiphong.

Before the massive increase of U.S. infantry forces, LAIRD says he told President Johnson "person to person," that LBJ would never succeed in pressuring the Reds to the bargaining table through land warfare.

"But that advice was rejected, because Johnson—no matter what he told the public—decided to go for victory and not for negotiations."

Now LAIRD feels it is too late to reverse the strategy because the troop outflow is "programmed for the next seven months."

LAIRD predicts there will be more than 400,000 American servicemen in Viet Nam shortly, with no end in sight—either to the demands on manpower or to the fighting.

[From the Commonweal, June 17, 1966]

THE CRIME OF SILENCE—ARE WE ACCOMPLICES IN MASS MURDER IN VIETNAM?

(By Gordon C. Zahn, author of "German Catholics and Hitler's Wars")

My thesis simply stated is this: our government is making murderers of us all.

This is not to be passed off as a "shock opening," a rhetorical device to win the attention of the reader. On the contrary, it is a deliberate and saddening conclusion to which I have been forced by my personal interpretation of current events. As each day passes with its new quota of injustice and atrocity, one thing becomes ever clearer. We are accomplices, before and after the fact, some of us by direct participation, the rest of us by our silent acquiescence.

This is not just a personal judgment reached by me and the rest of the dissident few in our midst who are trying to register some effective protest. My observation and discussions in England and elsewhere in Europe have revealed it as a widespread opinion and one that is gaining in intensity with each new escalation of the conflict in Vietnam. We cannot ignore it when a prominent German liberal writer demands publicly that American politicians and generals be brought before a new international tribunal to face charges of violating the standards we ourselves proclaimed at Nuremberg. Nor should we be too quick to pass this off as some fanatically extreme (or even "Communist-inspired") opinion. There are war criminals in our midst, and what is far worse, we know of them and their deeds—and close our eyes to them.

For example, some of these criminals were shown on Chicago television not too long ago in a film documentary prepared by the Canadian Broadcasting System. One memorable sequence concerned an act that, to say the least, was a clear violation of the Geneva conventions. A Vietcong captive was stretched out on the ground with one of his captors kneeling on his groin while another poured hatfuls of water down the victim's nostrils. When the unfortunate captive finally died—still "on camera," mind you—his body was unceremoniously kicked aside into a ditch. It is hard to decide which was worse: the disgusting deed itself or the picture of the others who stood around (Americans included, needless to say) looking quite pleased, even entertained, by the gruesome proceedings.

The same program went on to feature an American pilot filmed in the process of completing a "successful" bombing mission. One had to see and hear this to catch the excitement and jubilation in the pilot's voice as he described the splendor of the hits and the panic of the villagers scurrying for their lives while he looked down on them from above. It took me back to the Thirties for a moment, recollecting the horrified gasp with which most Americans greeted that Italian pilot who spoke of the "beauty" he found in the mixture of bombs, blood and flame that reminded him of "flowers" bursting into bloom as he ran his missions against the helpless Ethiopians. (One might even say the Italian must be given the better of the comparison: his was an ecstasy born of aesthetic appreciation; our countryman's delight stressed the technical perfection and sheer efficiency of his operation.)

The case does not rest on a single television documentary, however. Our national press has provided detailed descriptions of innumerable other instances of similar behavior—served to us, replete with photographs in many cases—with our breakfast coffee. Sometimes the atrocities are committed by our own men; more often by the allies for whose actions we must take full responsibility, since it is our support and encouragement that makes those actions possible. If, as it has been charged, Oradour and Lidice are today villages in Vietnam, these crimes against humanity must be on our consciences; and we should insist that those immediately responsible for them must someday be brought to judgment.

In a special sense, all of this involves us not only as Americans but as Christians and Catholics. In view of all the writing I have done about the failure of German Catholics

to effectively oppose the intrinsically evil policies and programs of the Nazi regime, it would be neither possible nor permissible for me to ignore the inescapable parallels which find American Catholics and their spiritual leaders remaining silent before the fact of the misdeeds being committed today by our nation and its allies. Indeed, not only is it a matter of failure to speak the word of protest that is so desperately needed; Catholic opinion, where it is registered, seems to favor an extension of those same policies which have led to the crimes described.

We have, for instance, the recent report of the shocking (but not at all surprising!) results of a national poll in which more than 60 percent of the Catholic respondents favored the use of "whatever added force is necessary to win." Read that carefully: *whatever added force is necessary!* I would like to think that these Catholics really did not mean what they said (nuclear bombing, perhaps? a "Final Solution" exterminating all suspected Vietcong sympathies?). Unfortunately, I am pessimistic enough to believe they did, and my pessimism is not at all lessened by the appeal by one of our leading Catholic "experts" in international affairs that we revise our traditional moral teaching on war to permit the intentional killing of innocents!

Catholics today are appalled by the flagrant nationalism in the statements of Military Bishop Rarkowski during the Nazi period. But what are we to make of the statements of our own military bishop who seems to have gone beyond even those extremes? At least Bishop Rarkowski couched his enthusiasm for Nazi Germany's war effort in his apparently sincere, however deluded we might think it to be, conviction that Hitler's wars were just wars. Cardinal Spellman, however, has reportedly embraced Decatur's dictum that, right or wrong, the nation's cause is to be supported. (And what is perhaps more scandalous than the Cardinal's statement is the fact that our more distinguished journals of Catholic opinion have let it pass without comment.)

THE WAY THE WAR IS FOUGHT

The justice or injustice of the war in Vietnam is not the central issue in this article, however. I have made it sufficiently clear elsewhere—and will undoubtedly find other occasions for doing so—that I do consider this a patently unjust war. But I am concerned here with something quite different: the acts and policies associated with the prosecution of the war which ought to be condemned by every Christian, even those—especially those—who do not share my overall rejection of the war itself.

Nor can this be read as justifying or "forgiving" the crimes committed by those on the other side. Murder and terrorism are to be condemned outright and unequivocally, irrespective of who may be employing them or for what purpose. It is quite irrelevant, too, whether the National Liberation Front assassinations of village officials be numbered in the tens, the hundreds, or the thousands—just as irrelevant as that senseless debate as to whether the Nazis exterminated six million Jews or "only" one million. The willful murder of even one man (whether by Nazi, Vietcong, South Vietnamese, or American "advisor") is a crime and deserves unhesitating condemnation as such. But of course, our primary responsibility is still the crimes committed by our men and our allies, and it is with these that this article is concerned.

Unless and until a massive Christian protest is voiced, that responsibility will not be met. There is little hope that improvement will originate with the national Administration. President Johnson shows little or no concern that his most consistent and enthusiastic support is coming from those very persons and groups who opposed him at the last election. In fact, he seems to rejoice in this as a manifestation of some kind of national "consensus," conveniently over-

June 29, 1966

looking the fact that he has lost the support of many who helped elect him. There is much justice to the cynical observation that, as long as we have the Goldwater policy, we might just as well have taken the man. If nothing else, that policy would have been presented in the blunt candor that distinguishes its author's public posture and not smothered, as each new escalation has been, in the sickening syrup of pietistic self-righteousness.

One might hope that more of our Catholics in the national legislature would be exerting their influence to assure a fuller recognition of, and respect for, the essential demands of morality; but, here again, the pattern seems to be that of an uncritical acceptance of whatever policy the State Department and the generals present as "necessary." We can take great pride in the outstanding exceptions to this, men like Senators KENNEDY and McCARTHY to mention only two, but the sad fact remains that the more consistent and certainly the most outspoken opposition to the Nation's involvement in Vietnam have come from men who are not of our faith.

Perhaps we cannot be too critical of our Catholic politicians on this score. The same pattern of unconcern and disregard has marked the actions (or, to be more accurate, the absence of any action) on the part of the hierarchy itself. Pope Paul (and John XXIII before him) might as well have been speaking as a Moslem leader if we are to judge by the echo his consistent appeals of peace and peace action have received from the spiritual spokesmen for the American Catholic flock. That scandalous eagerness on the part of those *Register* Catholics to embrace "whatever added force is needed to win" can be traced in large part to the failure of our bishops to provide any moral guidance or direction on this crucial moral issue. *Refusal* is probably a more accurate word than "failure" in this context, as the editors of *Continuum* and the *National Catholic Reporter* discovered in their futile effort to get the bishops to take a stand, or even to express an opinion, on some of the more pressing moral aspects of the war. One watches with great interest to see how Dr. O'Brien's comments on the question of intentional killing of innocents will be greeted by bishops who so recently participated in the quite contrary decision reached by the Fathers of Vatican II.

No one is insisting upon an official condemnation of the war or formal anathemas directed against those who take part in it. This would not, and should not, be the role of the bishop in this era of the emergent layman. Protest in the bishop's own name would be enough; less than that, however, is a scandal. When murder and torture become an everyday item in the newspapers and when they are done in fulfillment of a national policy or even only "excused" in the light of that policy, silence is worse than a scandal. It becomes a crime.

One can understand the hesitancy on the part of a bishop who finds it difficult to suggest to the men of his flock who have been called into service (and to the families they left behind!) that perhaps they should not be there, that they should certainly not be doing what they are doing there. We can also make allowance for the fact that our bishops, like the rest of us, are susceptible to considerations of national pride and patriotic attachment that make it difficult to take the true measure of our Nation's acts.

But to recognize these factors is not to justify the silence, any more than these same factors can be used to justify the support given by German bishops to Hitler's war effort. When whole villages, inhabitants and all, are covered with a blanket of napalm merely because there is a suspicion that they may harbor the Vietcong, there can no longer be any comfortable shelter for the Christian

under the principle of the double effect or any of the other loopholes we so conveniently read into the traditional "just war" morality. The weapons we are using in Vietnam and the targets we have chosen (not to mention those additional targets already being discussed as the next stage of escalation!), and all the other "irregularities" that occur with diabolical regularity—these have stripped off the disguises and nullified the qualifications so that murder stands revealed as murder.

It should not be left to a small, but happily growing, minority of Catholic priests and laymen to try to redeem the day for the Church in America in much the same manner as that even smaller handful of German Catholics who dared to resist the Nazi power. Our spiritual leaders have far less to justify their silence: no Gestapo is likely to be pounding on their doors or dragging their priests off to concentration camps. At least not yet.

There will be some to say that I have too much stress on the German parallels, and perhaps I have. In quantity and essential quality, the American atrocities in Vietnam fall far short of the crimes perpetrated by the Third Reich. But the parallels are there, and they are growing more insistent. Note, if you will, the developing "cult of the green beret" (with its equivalent of the Horst Wessel song and all). I would suggest that there are great similarities here to the adulation lavished upon the S.S. and S.A. "elite" corps in their day, to say nothing of the similarity in the "special services" they performed.

The parallels should be recognized for what they are, and this recognition should force all of us to re-examine and re-evaluate the nation's policies and our inescapable share of the responsibility for those policies and their consequences. The blood of innocents is already upon our hands. The longer we tolerate these things in silence, the greater will be the blot upon our national honor and the burden of sin upon our individual souls.

PROMISE OF MEDICARE TARNISHED BY SEGREGATION AND BY SHORT- AGES BORN OF ADMINISTRATION BUDGET SYNDROME

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the remarks I wish to make this morning relate to the fact that the medicare program for the aged will take effect on Friday, July 1. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are not ready for it, that there is bound to be great difficulty because we are not ready for it and that the reason we are not ready for it must be laid heavily at the door of the administration.

Unfortunately, however, the shining promise of this program to provide medical care for our older citizens is beclouded. On the eve of beginning this new program we find that:

First. Two years after title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was enacted, a large number of hospitals in some States remain segregated meaning that they will not provide equal facilities for older citizens of all races under medicare; and

Second. The administration has short-

sightedly failed to request adequate funds for ongoing, and authorized hospital training and health care programs to meet the acknowledged needs occasioned by medicare, population growth and the advancement of medical science. In addition, it has neglected to propose new programs to meet these easily anticipated needs.

In enacting medicare, the Congress and the Federal Government have, however, assumed a considerable responsibility. We have entered into a compact with 17 million of our citizens to provide effective insurance against crushing health care bills in their old age. We have exacted an individual premium for this protection and also we have directly taxed our working men and women, and our businesses under the social security system to pay for it. Beginning Friday, we must be ready to deliver.

In the year since the Social Security Amendments Act of 1965 became law, the Federal Government has been taking a long, hard look at the facilities which we have available for health care. The picture has not been reassuring. We find that we have an acute shortage of hospitals, of nursing homes and of doctors, nurses, technicians, and other health personnel. We also find that a large number of hospitals in some States remain segregated. While I applaud the efforts of many in the Federal Government to remedy these situations, I view with alarm and a sense of imminent crisis the inauguration of the new program.

Only last week, the White House announced that 80 percent of all hospitals in the country have been accredited for medicare and will be ready, at the end of the week to offer benefits and services to older citizens. This hopeful figure, however, is a national one, and obscures the core of the problem—the shocking shortage of accredited hospitals in Southern States. In Mississippi, for example, only 21.2 percent of all hospitals have complied with Federal regulations and are ready to serve all older citizens with equality on July 1. In Alabama 56.2 percent of the hospitals have qualified; in Georgia, 49.1 percent; Louisiana, 45.7 percent; and South Carolina, 50.5 percent. The reason certification has been withheld is the persistent, willful and illegal refusal of hospitals in these States to admit and treat patients without regard to race.

This is not a new or unexpected demand by the Federal Government. This is not a roadblock thrown up to hinder the implementation of medicare or to deny large numbers of older citizens the right to benefits. The impasse is the direct results of the violation of a law signed 2 years ago this weekend. For a full 24 months, despite the efforts of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, certain hospitals have been stalling on implementing desegregation plans. Most of them were built with 80 percent Federal funds; many perform research under Federal grants, provide Federal assistance to their nursing students and receive Federal payments for their welfare patients. Yet they have persistently refused to admit and treat Negro patients, equally with whites. Now they expect continued and expanded Federal

operations in such diverse areas as the Philadelphia and Harlem riots of 1964, the Watts riot of 1965 and the current wave of anti-Vietnamese-war demonstrations. The FBI considers the tactic so insidious that it has issued special instructions to its agents, explaining that the communist aims are "to arouse the passions of the people against law enforcement; to mislead the public; to smear, discredit and weaken law enforcement everywhere; and to divide, confuse and reduce seriously the strength of the opposition to communism."

Blaming all "police brutality" charges on the communists would be as incorrect as dismissing entirely the Red role in false anti-police propaganda. However, says Dr. Stefan T. Possony of Stanford University, an authority on Red psychological warfare: "It doesn't matter whether the propagandist's motive is outright subversion or simply extremist irresponsibility. The potential results of deliberate faking of accusations are the same: the communists want general public acceptance of the 'police brutality' slogan so they can achieve police disarmament."

MAN IN THE MIDDLE

Today's police officer is truly a man in the middle. Sociologists agree that slum dwellers often turn on police as symbols of the "power structure" that they blame for their plight. Policemen are expected to be social workers, judges, doctors and priests when they go on duty; yet often they do not get the official support they need. The former police chief of a major city privately told me, "Some politicians seem to regard gaining the political support of minority groups as more important than treating their accusations against police with fairness and objectivity."

The police role has been made still harder by instances of unbelievable judicial leniency toward criminals.* Take the case of the three young men with police records who made a vicious and unprovoked attack on Chicago police officer Frank Perry in 1963. The attackers pleaded guilty. Astonishingly, Cook County Judge Leslie E. Salter called Officer Perry a "crybaby" and turned his assailants loose on mere probation.

Compare with this the treatment of two who punched and kicked two Liverpool, England, policemen in 1962. They were sentenced to 18 months in jail, promptly appealed the judge's harshness, only to have the Court of Criminal Appeals double their jail term. "There must be deterrent sentences to ensure that police officers in Liverpool can safely carry out their duties," the court declared.

Attacks on police have become so frequent that the American Law Institute has recommended that states pass a model law clearly emphasizing the duty of every citizen to come quietly when arrested by a badge-displaying officer. Any questions of mistaken arrest would then be settled in court rather than in the street. The New York Times, urging the state legislature to pass such a law, declared, "In these days of increasing hoodlumism and street crime, the community rightly expects the police to assume risks, but in return it owes them reasonable protection. Policemen forced to make instantaneous decisions under trying circumstances should not become fair game for a mob."

The well-publicized vilification of America's policemen is hiding the fact that the police themselves are becoming the victims of brutality. The FBI's *Uniform Crime Reports* shows that one out of every ten policemen was assaulted in 1964 (the most recent year of record). In five years 225 officers were killed, and most of them left wives and children. In 1964 alone, felons killed 57 policemen.

* See "Take the Handcuffs off our Police!" The Reader's Digest, September '64.

THE STAKES

The harsh fact is that our nation is besieged by crime. During an average week, one city of 1,600,000 has 566 burglaries, 114 robberies, 15 rapes and about four killings. The situation is just as grim in suburban and rural areas, where nearly one third of all serious crimes occur among only one fifth of the population.

Statistics, however appalling, fail to tell the private horror of those attacked. A Los Angeles man going about his daily business is shot to death near his truck. A U.S. Congressman working late in his Capitol Hill office is knifed and robbed. A woman kneeling in prayer is dragged to a confessional and raped.

Anyone who has ever called for help in such danger knows the feeling of terror, and what it can mean to have police officers who do not hesitate to respond *instantly* and *forcefully*. Protecting the police from unjust "brutality" smears is actually protecting yourself. The stakes could be your home—or your life.

AWARD TO STROM THURMOND

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last Saturday, June 25, our colleague, STROM THURMOND, was honored by the Department of South Carolina American Legion. In recognition of his outstanding contributions to his community, State, and Nation, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Award.

Today I add my congratulations to Senator THURMOND for this well-earned recognition and to the South Carolina American Legion for its worthy selection.

STROM THURMOND has had a long and distinguished career both locally and nationally. He served in the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of his State's government before his election to this body 12 years ago. He was a practicing attorney and farmer.

His varied experience makes his counsel of great value. His military record and service was outstanding and his counsel concerning military preparedness has thus acquired added persuasiveness. His active role in State government gives urgency to his advocacy of the position that in many areas the States can simply do the better job.

He has a practical, commonsense approach to problems. And this approach is bottomed on a philosophy of government developed after long involvement with the intricacies of public affairs, civil and military; a deep love for our Constitution and respect for and trust in the people and their ability to govern themselves.

Senator THURMOND's varied career has brought honor to his name. And well it should, for he deserves the honors he receives.

Mr. President, I join the South Carolina American Legion in recognizing his contributions. I, too, salute this valuable and devoted service on behalf of his State and Nation.

THE CIVIL WAR WITHIN THE CIVIL WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, while the administration is escalating the undeclared war in southeast Asia, apparently in the belief that it can bomb our folly to some successful conclusion, the

political prospects which should have been kept paramount are declining. It could scarcely be otherwise in view of the character of the self-imposed junta of 10 generals, whom the United States is supporting.

Its Premier, Nguyen Cao Ky, whose one hero, by his own declarations, is Adolf Hitler, is using the weapons and materiel supplied by the United States to suppress the inevitable revolt in South Vietnam—the civil war within the civil war—which arises from his declared determination that the promised elections will be participated in only by those he and his fellow-generals approve. What a farce. We are supposedly and allegedly supporting freedom and democracy.

It is pertinent that 9 of the 10 generals composing the junta fought on the side of the French to reimpose its colonial rule on the people of Indochina. Obviously, a people long fighting for their independence, cannot be expected to be happy about the self-imposition of generals who opposed that independence.

This and much else is clearly brought out in a news dispatch in this morning's New York Times by its veteran correspondent, Charles Mohr, entitled: "U.S. Forces Frustrated in Political Aspects of Vietnamese War."

The obvious conclusion of his story would seem to be that we should not have been in southeast Asia militarily in the first place and should not be there now.

I ask unanimous consent that the aforementioned article be printed at this point in my remarks:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 29, 1966]
U.S. FORCES FRUSTRATED IN POLITICAL ASPECTS OF VIETNAMESE WAR

(By Charles Mohr)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, June 28—There is wide recognition that ultimate success or victory in the war in Vietnam will depend on political as well as military action.

The necessary political action, however, is difficult to implement.

It is difficult to bring the impressive weight of United States power to bear in rural South Vietnam without killing and maiming civilians as well as the guerrilla enemy.

It is difficult to find the manpower, administrative skill and determination in South Vietnam to carry out all of the desirable social, economic and political programs.

It is even difficult to give South Vietnam assistance without also causing inflation and subsequent public discontent about living costs.

On the purely military side, undeniable progress has been made.

REBELS' LOSSES HIGH

The Vietcong guerrillas still control almost as much territory and population as they did when full-scale United States intervention began last year, but the Vietcong's momentum toward victory has been stopped.

Whether statistics are accurate or not, punishing losses are being inflicted on the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese regulars.

Some persons assume that the enemy cannot sustain such losses much longer. This is, however, only an assumption. As of mid-1966, the guerrillas in South Vietnam remain a formidable force, larger than a year ago.

"One of the encouraging trends is the difficulty we are having in getting them to fight recently," said an American general, explaining that this could mean that the

effect of United States firepower was denying the enemy any prudent way to employ his troops.

American or South Vietnamese troops increasingly move into enemy base areas and stumble upon surprised guerrillas who, almost instinctively, stand and fight for as long as they can.

This is a complete reversal of the usual situation in guerrilla warfare.

Instead of picking their battleground, the guerrillas are finding it difficult to arrange profitable encounters and are obliged to fight in their own backyard.

VIETCONG HARD TO FIND

However, as the general also noted, the difficulty in engaging the enemy is a discouraging as well as an encouraging trend. Since the main thrust of the American military effort is to find and destroy enemy military units, any impediment to this process is unwelcome.

Progress is less evident on the political side of the war, and problems are abundant.

The United States military commander, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, has given special attention to the problem of civilian casualties and has admonished his troops that they must accept severe restraints on the battlefield.

But the high level of military activity and the need to save American lives are not always compatible with this policy. There are no statistics on civilian casualties, but a visit to any provincial hospital reveals many cases of victims of United States air and artillery power.

The Buddhist crisis in South Vietnam has had some effect on military progress. For many weeks the Government had more of its elite forces tied up on political duty, and lost control over at least one army division.

The Government of Nguyen Cao Ky has survived these difficulties. But Premier Ky's ability to stay in power through the use of police force poses a question that observers here are reluctant to answer.

Despite United States endorsement of the Premier, few Americans here would contend that he is an ideal instrument with which to wage a guerrilla war.

Enormous attention has been given to the question "Whom do the political Buddhists represent?" but whom, some observers ask, does Premier Ky represent?

In a way, the army. But even this is an oversimplification. The real answer is that South Vietnam does not have a Government closely identified with the mass of the population.

The most promising development of the year has been the rural pacification program. About 80 teams have begun to work in selected villages to root out Vietcong political workers, satisfy village complaints, provide some security and improve the standard of life. Other teams are in training.

TWO KEY FACTORS SEEN

This is only a minuscule beginning in a nation with 15,000 villages. Some Americans see serious flaws in the program and one of them thinks it has no more than 50-percent chance of success. But they find even such a prospect reason for good cheer.

The final outcome of the war will probably be decided by two factors.

One will be the pacification program. By common consensus the United States forces cannot be driven from South Vietnam by any means the North Vietnamese choose to throw against it. But the alien Americans probably cannot drive the Vietcong from the field, either, until the rural population joins in the effort.

The second factor is the determination of the enemy and his allies.

Until now, North Vietnamese infiltration into the South and local recruitment have roughly kept pace with losses suffered.

How long this equilibrium will continue may depend less on United States bombing than on North Vietnamese will power versus American will power. The North Vietnamese still have at their command large reserves to commit in the South. At the extreme, there is the threat of Chinese intervention.

"We've got a winning hand," said one American officer, "but we've got to bet it. I don't think you can bluff these people out of the game."

ORGANIZATION OF THE NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHY ASSOCIATION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, over the weekend an announcement was made in Washington concerning the formal organization of the National Oceanography Association. The organization was formed—in the words of a spokesman—to meet the "need for an organization through which thousands of members of the general public could express their interest and lend support for a greatly increased national effort in oceanography."

This is a most welcome development, as there is a growing recognition of the need to accelerate the tempo of this Nation's oceanographic efforts. We have lagged in this field in the past, and we still do. It is my hope that through the activities of groups like the National Oceanography Association, we will be able to make up for lost time and to strengthen, enlarge, and improve our current capabilities in marine science and technology.

The formation of the National Oceanography Association comes at a time when this Congress is making a good record in supporting oceanographic activities.

The Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act, approved by this Congress, was signed into law on June 10.

S. 2439, to establish sea grant colleges, has been reported by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Hearings on a similar bill have been held in the House.

As a cosponsor of both the Marine Resources Act and the sea grant college bill, I am hopeful that the National Oceanography Association will help to promote public interest and support for the legislation during its implementation.

On this occasion I extend my warmest congratulations and wish for the National Oceanography Association many years of fruitful and rewarding activities in the advancement of oceanography.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a press release describing the purposes and plans of the National Oceanography Association and listing the directors of the Association.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 26.—A group of the top people in oceanography, including representatives of major companies, scientists and educators, are meeting in Washington today to formally organize the National Oceanography Association.

With the stated purpose of mobilizing public support for a "high priority, full-scale national oceanography program, making use of all necessary resources of industry, backed

up by the U.S. Government", NOA is expected to be a powerful force in speeding developments in oceanography.

Those meeting here today are members of the first Board of Directors of the National Oceanography Association. The Board represents a broad cross section, including such well-known people as J. Louis Reynolds, Chairman of Reynolds International, Inc.; Admiral Arthur W. Radford, U.S.N. (Ret.) Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Walter Cronkite, News Editor of the Columbia Broadcasting System; and Dr. William A. Nierenberg, atomic scientist and Director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. National officers will be elected at the meeting.

Plans are being made by NOA's blue ribbon board for a campaign of public information and education to stimulate nationwide interest and support for accelerating the research and exploration of the ocean, and making possible new uses of the ocean and its resources.

A statement issued by the organizing group in advance of the meeting said:

"Although important advances have been made in the field of oceanography in recent years, at the current rate of development of scientific knowledge and engineering skills, it will be many years before the United States can begin to capitalize fully on ocean resources. In the meantime, other nations (principally Russia and Japan) have been pushing ahead in what is clearly a race for control of these resources.

"So vast and complex are the problems of oceanography that their early solution requires broad public support for a high-priority, full scale national oceanography program in which all necessary resources of the U.S. Government shall be used to supplement those of industry. Such support is necessary to accelerate research, exploration and development of the ocean and thereby help to assure our nation's security and economic development.

"If the United States does not act quickly to develop the capability of possessing and controlling its marine environment, we may find ourselves in the same situation as when the first Sputnik was launched in outer space. Furthermore, in "inner space"—the ocean—there are great opportunities which are not being realized because of the slow pace of ocean development. The purpose of NOA is to help take advantage of the opportunities—for national advancement, for profit, for pleasure, and for meeting basic human needs—which lie just across the threshold of the ocean."

The first meeting of the Board of NOA culminates more than a year of organizational work involving discussions with many of the leaders in the field of oceanography. A spokesman for the organizing group said that it became apparent months ago that there was a need for an organization through which thousands of members of the general public could express their interest and lend support for a greatly increased national effort in oceanography. NOA was formed to meet that need.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHY ASSOCIATION

Vincent R. Bailey, Vice President & General Manager, Perry Submarine Builders, Inc., West Palm Beach, Florida.

Max Banzhaf, Staff Vice President, Armstrong Cork Company, Inc., Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Thomas D. Barrow, Director, Humble Oil & Refining Company, Houston, Texas.

Dr. William T. Burke, College of Law, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Dr. W. M. Chapman, Director, Division of Resources, Van Camp Sea Food Company, San Diego, California.

John H. Clotworthy, Vice President, Westinghouse Defense & Space Center, General